



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

twenty-one, when it is claimed that he commanded a ship for King René, he was still a weaver, helping his father keep a little tavern, that he did not go to Portugal in 1474, but in 1476, that many of the facts stated by his son and by Las Casas and Herrera and Oviedo, were invented by Columbus, to be used in bolstering up his claim to hereditary greatness. Only in our own day the *History* of Las Casas was printed for the first time by the Academy of History of Madrid, and while Ferdinand Columbus and Herrera drew most of their material from it, there are incongruities suggesting that Columbus varied in his story and tried to improve it at each retelling, yet made positive statements that are at variance with contemporary documents only lately published. It is not necessary to accept all of Mr. Vignaud's hypotheses and inferences, but it is impossible not to admire and respect his bibliographical fulness, his exact references, his painful search after the truth, and his faith in the value and importance of modern canons of historical criticism. To solve the doubts as to the time and place of birth of Columbus, he gives references to over a hundred volumes, from the contemporary sources, Navarrete, Ferdinand Columbus, Las Casas, to the monumental work of the Italian scholars, with its wealth of original materials, to works specially devoted to the question of the date and place of the birth of Columbus, and then the authorities for each of the dates claimed from 1434 to 1456. Mr. Vignaud has dedicated his book to Professor Alcée Fortier of Tulane University, New Orleans,—a grateful tribute to a scholarly historian, and to their common mother state, Louisiana. He promises further volumes on the later years and greater deeds of Columbus, so that we may yet hope to know all the truth as he sees it. Until his work is completed, it is too soon to criticize his reasoning, but even in this first part, he shows a desire to get at the truth. How far his method may be found the best for his purpose can only be decided when he gives the world his whole story of the real Columbus.

Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

By GEORGE UNWIN. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1904. Pp. viii, 277.)

UNWIN announces as the chief purpose of his book the bridging of the chasm that separates medieval from modern industrial history, the discovery of the links between the gild and the trade-union. There is here a certain external similarity with the subject of Brentano's brilliant essay of 1870 on the history of gilds and the origin of trade-unionism. There is an added resemblance in the gift for generalization possessed by the two writers; both dwell upon analogies and parallels rather than upon distinctions and differences, and in both, therefore, the predilection for the comparative method is marked. But on the special theme in question, Unwin goes farther than his forerunner, in the amount of evidence adduced and in his conclusions. Brentano, it will be remembered, expressly denied any direct connection between the

trade-union and the craft-gild or even the journeymen-fraternities, and asserted that the modern organization of labor was the successor of the older form only in so far as both had arisen in periods of stress to meet the aggressions of a class economically dominant. Unwin, however, while recognizing that the descendants of the craft-gild comprise many diverse elements in modern economic life, does not hesitate to draw up a pedigree in which the trade-union is directly affiliated with the mediæval gild.

This affiliation is traced in the earlier period from the printed sources, but there is some use of manuscript material and less resort to Continental parallels in the sections dealing with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The course of development follows no straight line, but is devious, involving shiftings, amalgamations and divisions of economic interests and social classes. From the later fourteenth century onward, the growth of capital, of the trading element and of monopolistic exclusiveness in the gilds, which depressed the economic and social position of the poorer industrial members, rendered the status of master constantly more inaccessible to the journeyman, with a consequent growth of journeyman-organization and class-feeling. Ashley saw in the yeomanry of the London gilds a journeyman-association; the Webbs, using the same evidence, pointed out the existence within the yeomanry of a number of masters and traders. Both views, according to Unwin, are correct. The yeomanry was originally composed of journeymen alone, but the development of the domestic form of industry tended to bring increasing numbers of the depressed small masters and of the journeymen under similar conditions of employment and to the same economic level. It was natural, therefore, that both classes coalesced and sought to use their combined strength against the aggressions of the merchant employers dominating the gild. In the yeomanry organization of the Elizabethan livery company, the small masters, recruited from the submerged masters of the gild and from the more energetic of the journeymen, had become the leaders of the rank and file of the journeymen members. It is in the efforts toward independent association on the part of this newly amalgamated class that Unwin finds the chief link between the gild and the trade-union. The favorable opportunity offered by the fiscal necessities and the interested encouragement of the Stuart government was utilized by some of the small-master-journeyman combinations to secure independence through separate incorporation. A little later, under the impulse of the democratic movement of the Commonwealth, others of these associations in the older companies unsuccessfully demanded their "primitive rights" of participation in the control of the company, at least in so far as to elect the wardens of their own yeomanry. But with this outburst, the attempts of the associated small masters and journeymen to constitute themselves an independent organization within the framework of the obsolescent industrial order came practically to an end. Though the associations already incorporated attempted to safeguard their economic position by

joint-stock industrial experiments, their privileges had fallen into the hands of speculative capitalists. And the few feeble petitions for incorporation after the Restoration came to nothing. The tide was already setting in another direction, toward the formation of new industrial classes out of the elements temporarily associated. This is exemplified in the yeomanry of the Clothworkers' Company which had split, on the one side, into a class of larger employers, the forerunners of the modern captains of industry, on the other into the mass of journeymen without capital who by the end of the seventeenth century were initiating that permanent organization of wage-earners which later developed into the trade-union.

In the course of the discussion of his principal theme, Unwin touches suggestively a number of other related topics. Following the lead of Ashley and Mrs. Green, he holds that the struggle of the craftsmen with the merchant oligarchy of the medieval town was not lacking in England, but he adds that this conflict between industrial and trading capital was prevented from finding a constitutional expression, analogous to the political rise of the craft-gild in many Continental towns, by the readiness of the English town-oligarchy to absorb the successful members of the handicrafts. The later antagonism of interests within the towns and between town and country, in the Tudor period, concurrently with that projection of the older town-monopoly on a wider scale which followed the expansion of commerce and the enlargement of the economic area, is viewed at a new angle, by applying the conception, above mentioned, of the conflict of industrial and trading capital. In this connection, however, it may well be questioned whether the sixteenth century, as Unwin asserts, "brought to completion" the national economy. And the suggestion may be ventured that the idea of the "conflict of trading and industrial capital" may easily be overworked. This formula, so frequently employed in the book, is convenient and doubtless often true, but the fact which Unwin himself incidentally mentions, that the functions of the trading and of the industrial capitalists down to a comparatively late date were frequently combined in the same individual, should have served as a more efficient check to the fascinating flow of generalization.

An interesting chapter is devoted to protectionism under James I. Unwin opposes the widely held opinion that England owed her start in international competition to the successful adoption of an energetic mercantilist policy of protection, intimately associated with the development of monopoly. On the contrary, the attempt of the Stuarts to uphold a strongly protectionist régime broke down under the pressure for internal freedom of trade. The ultimate triumph of free trade in England was but the logical outcome of the movement toward commercial freedom, tacitly disregarding or expressly abrogating statutory restrictions, which was initiated by the Parliament of 1624. This view seems to be suggested by Unwin as a subject for further investigation rather

than as the matured result of research; he brings, at any rate, little evidence in support of his position.

Deficiency of evidence, however, becomes of more moment when associated with the chief thesis of the work, the pedigree of the trade-union. This thesis is defended with acuteness and vigor and illustrated with knowledge both of the English sources and of German and French industrial history, but it is unfortunate that at vital points of the argument inference takes the place of fact. The central position as to the relations of classes within the Elizabethan yeomanry rests almost entirely upon the interpretation of exiguous entries from the records of one London company, the Clothworkers. Again, for his assertion of the continuity of development from the journeyman-organization of the seventeenth to the trade-union of the nineteenth century, Unwin adduces but one instance, that of the London hatters. And at the critical period there is here a sad gap in the evidence. From the time of the journeymen's wage-disputes at the close of the seventeenth to the emergence of the hatters' union in the latter part of the eighteenth century there is a total absence of information as to the organization of the workmen. The continuity is only an assumption; it is not as yet a certainty. It may prove impossible to obtain full and satisfactory evidence of the plausible hypotheses which Unwin advances, but it is to be hoped that the study so auspiciously begun may be further prosecuted, preferably by Unwin himself, and that he may extend his researches in the archives of the London companies beyond the two he has already explored.

But aside from the necessary criticism called forth in part by the inadequacy of the evidence, in part by the defects of the author's own excellent qualities, there is much to praise in this, Unwin's first book. In temper and spirit it is admirable. The presentation is in general clear, though the mazes of detail he has explored might well have bewildered a guide of less competence and verve. With all due respect to the work which has prepared the way and with full recognition of the work still to be done, of the questions still to be answered,—questions which it is part of Unwin's service to have assisted in formulating,—his essay must be regarded, in my opinion, as one of the most stimulating contributions of recent years to English economic history.

EDWIN F. GAY.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late Lord ACTON, LL.D.; edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Volume III., *The Wars of Religion.* (London and New York: The Macmillan Company. 1905. Pp. xxvi, 914.)

THE field covered by the present installment of this monumental work does not exactly correspond to the idea conveyed by its title. It stops short of the last and greatest of the "Wars of Religion", the Thirty Years' War, which is reserved for consideration in a later vol-